

United States Tracent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	o.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,117		01/04/2002	Steven Ausnit	769-222 Div.2	1073
29540	7590	06/15/2004		EXAMINER	
PITNEY			SIPOS, JOHN		
7 TIMES NEW YO		E 10036-7311		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
1,2,,, 10	, -·-			3721	/3
				DATE MAILED: 06/15/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			9			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/040,117	AUSNIT, STEVEN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	-			
	John Sipos	3721				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address -				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.	ION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a					
 If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON y statute, cause the application to become Al	NTHS from the mailing date of this communical BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ation.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠	This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for a	llowance except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the merits	s is			
closed in accordance with the practice ur	nder <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.E). 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>40-42 and 48-50</u> is/are pending	in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wi	thdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) 40-42 & 48-50 is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa	aminer.					
[0] The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the o	correction is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	1(d).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by t	he Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo	oreign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
 Certified copies of the priority docu 	iments have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority docu	iments have been received in A	Application No				
Copies of the certified copies of the	e priority documents have been	received in this National Stage				
application from the International E						
* See the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the certified copies not	received.				
Attachment(s)						
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94) 		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/: Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 3721

The previous Office action has been vacated and replaced with the following action.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS BASED ON PRIOR ART

Claims 40-42 and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. '102(b) as being clearly anticipated by the patent to Thomas (5,713,669) or Dobreski (5,669,715). Each of the patents to Thomas and Dobreski disclose a method of opening bags that comprise a slider/zipper and a tamper evident structure at least partially enveloping the zipper. Each discloses a bag that comprises a package body, zipper closure with two mating profiles (24/28 in both patents), a slider on the closure (32 in both patents) for opening and closing the closure and the bag, a tamper evident structure (36/38 in both patents) encasing the zipper closure and perforation line (40 in both patents). The opening process comprises removing the tamper evident structure along the perforation line and moving the slider to disengage the zipper profiles to open the bag. See column 4, line 6 et seq. of Thomas and column 4, line 21 et seq of Dobreski...

Claims 40-42 and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. '102(e) as being clearly anticipated by the patent to Stolmeier (6,257,763). The patent to Stolmeier discloses the method of opening bags that comprise a slider/zipper and a tamper evident structure. This patent discloses bags that comprise a package body, zipper closure with two mating profiles (70), a slider on the closure (71) for opening and closing the closure and bag, a tamper evident structure (60) encasing the zipper closure and perforation line (72). The opening process comprises removing the tamper evident structure along the perforation

Art Unit: 3721

line and moving the slider to disengage the zipper profiles to open the bag. See column 3, line 59 et seq.

Claims 40 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. '102(e) as being clearly anticipated by the patent to Thieman (5,956,924). The patent to Thieman discloses the method of opening bags that comprise a slider/zipper and a tamper evident structure. This patent discloses bags that comprise a package body, zipper closure with two mating profiles (32/34), a slider on the closure (48) for opening and closing the closure/bag and a tamper evident structure (127) encasing the zipper closure. The opening process comprises removing the tamper evident structure and moving the slider to disengage the zipper profiles to open the bag. See column 6, line 6 et seq.

Claims 41,42,49 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. '103(a) as being unpatentable over the patent to Thieman (5,956,924) in view of Hustad (5,456,928). The patent to Thieman lacks the use of perforations lines. The patent to Hustad discloses the method of opening bags that comprise a zipper and a tamper evident structure. This patent discloses bags that comprise a package body, zipper closure with two mating profiles (17/18), and a tamper evident structure (integral 21 or separate tape 31) encasing the zipper closure and perforation line (25,33) to ease the removal of the tamper evident structure. The opening process of Hustad comprises removing the tamper evident structure along the perforation line and separating the zipper profiles to open the bag. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the Thieman bag with perforation lines as shown by Hustad to ease the removal of the tamper evident structure. Note that both the Thieman and Hustad methods use a separate tamper evident tape.

Art Unit: 3721

RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are not persuasive and the response to those arguments of the previous Office action is repeated..

Applicant's argument that since the instant claims were copied from patents wherein these claims were found allowable is not convincing. Upon renewed filing of the claims a complete examination is made of the claims. The examination includes a review of the claims for rejections based on formal matters as well as prior art. The rejections made in the last Office action are considered proper and are maintained.

Contrary to Applicant's argument that Thieman does not appear to remove the tamper evident structure as recited in the claims, Thieman clearly states and shows in Figure 5 the application of a separate structure 127 "over the exterior of slider" (see column 6, line 10). Since the tamper evident structure is placed over the slider it needs to be removed before the slider can be accessed.

Regarding the Stolmeier reference, it is clear from the drawings (for example, Figure 7) and the specification (column 3, line 59 et seq.) that perforations 72 are provided "which facilitates removing the tamper evident sheet 60" thereby allowing access to the slider.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 3721

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to **Examiner John Sipos** at telephone number **(703) 308-1882.** The examiner can normally be reached from 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM Monday through Thursday.

The FAX number for Group 3700 of the Patent and Trademark Office is (703) 305-3579.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Peter Vo, can be reached at (703) 308-1789.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

E. ROLLINS-CROSS GROUP DIRECTOR TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700 John Sipos

Primary Examiner

Art/Unit 3721